1	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General
2	of the State of California STEVEN H. ZEIGEN, Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice
3	Department of Justice 110 West A Street, Suite 1100 Post Office Box 85266
4	San Diego, California 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2074
5	Attorneys for Complainant
6	Accorneys for complainanc
7	
8	BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PODIATRIC MEDICINE
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	SIATE OF CALAFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Accusation) Case No. 1B-95-52549 Against:
12	DOROTHY E. BAUER, D.P.M.) A C C U S A T I O N
13	4843 Arlington Ave.) Riverside, CA 92504)
14	Podiatric Medicine)
15	Certificate No. E 3071,
16	Respondent.)
17	
18	Complainant James E. Rathlesberger, as cause for
19	disciplinary action alleges as follows:
20	<u>PARTIES</u>
21	1. Complainant, James E. Rathlesberger, is the
22	Executive Director of the Board of Podiatric Medicine
23	(hereinafter the "Board") and brings this Accusation solely in
24	his official capacity.
25	2. On or about December 10, 1982, Podiatric Medicine
26	Certificate No. E 3071 was issued by the Board to Dorothy E.

relevant to the charges brought herein, this license has been in full force and effect. Unless renewed, it will expire on March 31, 1998.

1.6

JURISDICTION 1

- 3. This accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following sections of the California
 Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "Code"):
 - A. Section 2222 of the Code provides that the California Board of Podiatric Medicine shall enforce and administer Article 12 (Enforcement) of Chapter 5 of the Medical Practice Act as to doctors of podiatric medicine. Any acts of unprofessional conduct or other violations proscribed by Chapter 5 are applicable to licensed doctors of podiatric medicine.

The California Board of Podiatric Medicine may order the revocation, suspension, or other restriction of, or the modification of that penalty, and the reinstatement of any certificate of a doctor of podiatric medicine within its authority as granted by Chapter 5 and in conjunction with the administrative hearing procedures established pursuant to Sections 11371, 11372, 11373, and 11529 of the Government Code. For these purposes, the California Board of Podiatric Medicine shall exercise the powers granted and be governed by the procedures set forth in Chapter 5.

B. Section 2947(a) of the Code provides that the Board may order the revocation of, or the imposition of probationary conditions upon, a certificate to practice

- C. Section 2227(a) of the Code provides that the Board may revoke, suspend for a period not to exceed one year, or place on probation and order the payment of probation monitoring costs, the license of any licensee who has been found guilty under the Medical Practice Act.
- D. Section 2234 of the Code provides, in part, that unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

"

- "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts.
- "(d) Incompetence.
- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.

"..."

E. Section 2261 of the Code provides that knowingly making or signing any certificate or other document directly or indirectly related to the practice of medicine or podiatry which falsely represents the existence or nonexistence of a state of facts, constitutes unprofessional conduct.

///

1.8

G. Section 810(a) of the Code provides that it shall constitute unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of a license or certificate, for a health care professional to do any of the following in connection with his professional activities: (1) knowingly present or cause to be presented any false or fraudulent claim for the payment of a loss under a contract of insurance, or (2) knowingly prepare, make, or subscribe any writing, with intent to present or use the same, or to allow it to be presented or used in support of any such claim.

F. Section 2497.5(a) of the Code provides that the Board may request the administrative law judge, under his or her proposed decision in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the board, to direct any licensee found guilty of unprofessional conduct to pay to the board a sum not to exceed the actual and reasonable costs of the investigation and prosecution of the case.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

4. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action on account of the following:

Patient Marjorie S.

A. On or about July 14, 1995, Marjorie S. went to see respondent for the first time complaining of pain in her left big toe. She had been unable to wear closed shoes for two weeks, and the pain was worse when walking. No

 record of any physical examination of Marjorie S. by respondent appears in Marjorie S.' patient chart.

Respondent diagnosed and treated Marjorie S. for an acutely infected ingrown toenail. Respondent removed part of the toenail from Marjorie S.' left big toe and also used chemicals on the area to prevent the ingrown part of the nail from growing back.

- B. During the visit of July 14, 1995, respondent told patient Marjorie S. that respondent would accept whatever Medicare paid for the procedure(s) done by respondent as payment in full but asked Marjorie S. to pay for the procedure, and Medicare would reimburse Marjorie. S. Marjorie S. gave respondent a check for \$234.54.
- C. Patient Marjorie S. did not come in for a scheduled follow-up visit on July 17, 1995, and next saw respondent on July 20, 1995. Respondent checked Marjorie S.' big toe, and found the infection cleared and the wound was healing. This was Marjorie S.' last visit to respondent for medical care.
- D. On August 7, 1995, Marjorie S. received a check from Medicare for \$143.74, reimbursing her for the cost of her treatment by respondent. Accompanying the check was a Medicare "Explanation of Benefits" (E.O.B.) which reflected that respondent had billed Medicare for \$179.68 for respondent's care of Marjorie S.
- E. Marjorie S. called respondent's office the next day, on August 8, 1995, to discuss the discrepancy

1.6

- F. On August 11, 1995, Marjorie S. had not heard from respondent's office and called again. She was told respondent would look into the matter and would be in touch with Marjorie S.
- G. On August 26, 1995, Marjorie S. returned from a vacation and found no communication from respondent, although she had asked respondent's office to leave a message on her answering machine or drop her a note.

 Marjorie S. again called respondent's office on August 29, 1995. The person Marjorie S. spoke with knew nothing of the problem, and said she would have to ask someone to return Marjorie S.' call.
- H. On August 31, 1995, Marjorie S. had not heard from respondent, so she called respondent's office again twice. Marjorie S. was asked to come to respondent's office and bring the Medicare E.O.B.'s on September 1, 1995.

 Marjorie S. brought the requested documents to respondent's office on September 1, 1995.
- I. On September 7, 1995, Marjorie S. still had not heard from respondent and called respondent's office, leaving a message requesting that respondent return her call. On September 8, 1995, Marjorie S. received a telephone message from respondent, and respondent told Marjorie S. to stop discussing her billing problems with the

office staff. Respondent said she would handle the matter personally.

- J. On September 18, 1995, Marjorie S. had not heard from respondent and again called her office, leaving a message for respondent to return her call.
- K. On September 26, 1995, Marjorie S. received a check from Medicare for \$38.16 with an E.O.B. which reflected that respondent had billed Medicare for \$57.01 for an office visit on April 11, 1995. Marjorie S. had not visited respondent's office or been treated by respondent on that date, as her first contact with respondent was on July 14, 1995. Marjorie S. returned the check to Medicare the next day.

Patient Martha L.

- L. On February 16, 1994, patient Martha L., who at the time was 32 years old, injured her right ankle and Achilles tendon. She went to Riverside Community Hospital Emergency Room for initial care, and was told to follow up with a private practitioner. Martha L. went to respondent's office after she was unsuccessful in making an appointment with an orthopedist.
- M. Patient Martha L. visited respondent's office on February 17, 1994.
- N. Martha L. had been a patient of respondent's in the past. Martha L. told respondent that Martha L. was having great difficulty in walking and was in considerable pain. Respondent did a physical examination of Martha L.'s

right ankle and Achilles tendon, and diagnosed a partial tear of the Achilles tendon. Martha L. was in so much pain that respondent had difficulty conducting the examination. However, respondent was able to cast Martha L. for orthotics during the examination.

- O. Respondent elected not to treat Martha L. by applying a series of casts to the affected area. Respondent did not perform nor cause to be performed any diagnostic studies such as an M.R.I. before treating Martha L.'s ankle and Achilles tendon.
- P. Respondent performed an unnecessary surgical repair on Martha L.'s right Achilles tendon on February 18, 1994, at the Corona Regional Medical Center.
- Q. At the time she performed the surgery, respondent was not certified in foot and ankle surgery by the American Board of Podiatric Surgery and did not possess an ankle certificate.
- R. Respondent followed Martha L. during her recovery from the surgery through June 27, 1994.

 Respondent's post-operative care of Martha L. consisted of cast changes, splint changes, and bi-weekly ultrasound treatments, and instructing Martha L. to do range-of-motion exercises at home. Respondent did not perform nor refer Martha L. out for physical therapy.
- 5. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct in that she committed repeated negligent acts in her care and treatment of

- A. Respondent did not record any physical examination of patient Marjorie S. in the chart.
- B. Respondent did not record any report of the operation or procedure she performed on Marjorie S., did not record any information on the type of anesthetic used, and did not include the patient consent, if any was given, in the chart.
- C. Respondent did unnecessary surgery, repairing the partially torn Achilles tendon without sufficient medical indication, on Martha L.
- D. Respondent performed the surgery on Martha L. prematurely, within about 48 hours of the patient's injury, and consequently failed to allow time for the injury to be properly evaluated.
- E. Respondent failed to employ proper diagnostic techniques and procedures as to Martha L., and specifically should have ordered and evaluated an M.R.I. to evaluate the need for and extent of any surgery before performing that surgery.
- F. Respondent failed to provide reasonable postsurgical care for Martha L. in that respondent failed to
 vigorously rehabilitate the injury with physical therapy.
 Respondent neither provided nor ordered physical therapy for
 Martha L. after the surgery.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Incompetence)

- 6. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct in that she was incompetent in her care and treatment of patient Martha L., in violation of Code sections 2222, 2227, 2497 and 2234(d), as described in paragraph 4 above which is incorporated herein by reference. Specifically:
 - A. Respondent did unnecessary surgery, repairing the partially torn Achilles tendon without sufficient medical indication, on Martha L.
 - B. Respondent performed the surgery on Martha L. prematurely, within about 48 hours of the patient's injury, and consequently failed to allow time for the injury to be properly evaluated.
 - C. Respondent failed to employ proper diagnostic techniques and procedures as to Martha L., and specifically should have ordered and evaluated an M.R.I. to evaluate the need for and extent of any surgery before performing that surgery.
 - D. Respondent failed to provide reasonable postsurgical care for Martha L. in that respondent failed to
 vigorously rehabilitate the injury with physical therapy.
 Respondent neither provided nor ordered physical therapy for
 Martha L. after the surgery.

26 ///

27 | //

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Insurance Fraud)

7. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct in that she (a) knowingly presented or caused to be presented a false or fraudulent claim for the payment of a loss under a contract of insurance, and/or (b) knowingly prepared or made a writing, with intent to present or use the same, in support of such a false or fraudulent claim in her care and treatment of patient Marjorie S., in violation of Code sections 2222, 2227, 2497 and 2261, as described in paragraph 4 above which is incorporated herein by reference. Marjorie S. was not seen by respondent on April 11, 1995, yet respondent electronically submitted a bill to Medicare for a visit on that date in the amount of \$57.01.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(False Statements)

8. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct in that she knowingly made a document related to the practice of podiatry which falsely represented the existence of a state of facts in her care and treatment of patient Marjorie S., in violation of Code sections 2222, 2227, 2497 and 2261, as described in paragraph 4 above which is incorporated herein by reference.

Marjorie S. was not seen by respondent on April 11, 1995, yet respondent electronically submitted a bill to Medicare for a visit on that date in the amount of \$57.01.

///

1.4

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dishonest or Corrupt Acts)

9. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct in that she committed an act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the functions or duties of a doctor of podiatric medicine in her care and treatment of patient Marjorie S., in violation of Code sections 2222, 2227, 2497 and 2234(e), as described in paragraph 4 above which is incorporated herein by reference. Marjorie S. was not seen by respondent on April 11, 1995, yet respondent electronically submitted a bill to Medicare for a visit on that date in the amount of \$57.01.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(General Unprofessional Conduct)

10. Respondent Dorothy E. Bauer, D.P.M., is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct in that she committed general unprofessional conduct in her care and treatment of patients Marjorie S. and Martha L., in violation of Code sections 2222, 2227, 2497 and 2234, as described in paragraph 4 above which is incorporated herein by reference. Specifically:

A. Respondent did not record any physical examination of patient Marjorie S. in the chart.

24 ///

///

1.9

26 ///

27 ///

- B. Respondent did not record any report of the operation or procedure she performed on Marjorie S., did not record any information on the type of anesthetic used, and did not include the patient consent, if any was given, in the chart.
 - C. Respondent did unnecessary surgery, repairing the partially torn Achilles tendon without sufficient medical indication, on Martha L.
 - D. Respondent performed the surgery on Martha L. prematurely, within about 48 hours of the patient's injury, and consequently failed to allow time for the injury to be properly evaluated.
 - E. Respondent failed to employ proper diagnostic techniques and procedures as to Martha L., and specifically should have ordered and evaluated an M.R.I. to evaluate the need for and extent of any surgery before performing that surgery.
 - F. Respondent failed to provide reasonable postsurgical care for Martha L. in that respondent failed to
 vigorously rehabilitate the injury with physical therapy.
 Respondent neither provided nor ordered physical therapy for
 Martha L. after the surgery.
 - G. Although Marjorie S. was not seen by respondent on April 11, 1995, respondent electronically submitted a bill to Medicare for a visit on that date in the amount of \$57.01.

27 | ///

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board issue a decision:

- Revoking or suspending Podiatric Medical
 Certificate No. E 3071, heretofore issued to respondent Dorothy
 E. Bauer, D.P.M.;
- 2. Ordering respondent to pay to the Board the actual and reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case pursuant to Code section 2497.5(a);
- 3. If placed on probation, ordering respondent to pay the costs of probation monitoring;
- 4. Taking such other and further action as the Board deems necessary and proper.

DATED:

James E. Rathlesber

Executive Director

Board of Podiatric Medicine

State of California

Complainant

i:\all\zeigen\bauer.bpm 8/4/97